UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/518,618 | 12/22/2004 | Michael F. Holick | 2317.0430001/RWE | 8983 |
| STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C. 1100 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. | | | EXAMINER | |
| | | | WESTERBERG, NISSA M | |
| WASHINGTON, DC 20005 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 1618 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 03/23/2009 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| Notice of About a const | 10/518,618 | HOLICK ET AL. | | |
| Notice of Abandonment | Examiner | Art Unit | | |
| | Nissa M. Westerberg | 1618 | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication app | | | | |
| This application is abandoned in view of: | | | | |
| Applicant's failure to timely file a proper reply to the Office (a) ☐ A reply was received on (with a Certificate of M period for reply (including a total extension of time of, but it does not be a proposed reply was received on, but it does not proposed reply was received on, but it does not proposed reply was received on, but it does not proposed reply was received on, but it does not proposed reply was received on, but it does not proposed reply was received on, but it does not proposed reply was received on, but it does not proposed reply was received on, but it does not proposed reply was received on, but it does not proposed reply was received on, but it does not proposed reply was received on, but it does not proposed reply was received on, but it does not proposed reply was received on, but it does not proposed reply was received on, but it does not proposed reply was received on, but it does not proposed reply was received on, but it does not proposed reply was received on, but it does not proposed reply was received on | lailing or Transmission dated month(s)) which expired on |), which is after the expiration of the | | |
| (A proper reply under 37 CFR 1.113 to a final rejection application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C | n consists only of: (1) a timely filed ar Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); o | nendment which places the | | |
| (c) A reply was received on but it does not constitutional rejection. See 37 CFR 1.85(a) and 1.111. (See 6 | | mpt at a proper reply, to the non- | | |
| (d) ⊠ No reply has been received. | | | | |
| 2. Applicant's failure to timely pay the required issue fee and from the mailing date of the Notice of Allowance (PTOL-8: (a) The issue fee and publication fee, if applicable, was | 5). received on (with a Certifica | ate of Mailing or Transmission dated | | |
| (b) The submitted fee of \$ is insufficient. A balance | e of \$ is due. | | | |
| The issue fee required by 37 CFR 1.18 is \$ The issue fee required by 37 CFR 1.18 is \$ | The publication fee, if required by 37 | CFR 1.18(d), is \$ | | |
| (c) \square The issue fee and publication fee, if applicable, has no | ot been received. | | | |
| 3. Applicant's failure to timely file corrected drawings as requal Allowability (PTO-37). (a) Proposed corrected drawings were received on | | | | |
| after the expiration of the period for reply. | | | | |
| (b) ☐ No corrected drawings have been received. | | | | |
| The letter of express abandonment which is signed by the the applicants. | e attorney or agent of record, the assi | ignee of the entire interest, or all of | | |
| 5. The letter of express abandonment which is signed by an 1.34(a)) upon the filing of a continuing application. | attorney or agent (acting in a repres | entative capacity under 37 CFR | | |
| 6. The decision by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interfere of the decision has expired and there are no allowed clain | | e the period for seeking court review | | |
| 7. The reason(s) below: | | | | |
| The abandonment was confirmed by Robert Esmon | d on March 17, 2009. | | | |
| /Michael G. Hartley/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1618 | /Nissa M Westerberg/ Examiner, Art Unit 1618 | | | |
| Petitions to revive under 37 CFR 1.137(a) or (b), or requests to withdra | w the holding of abandonment under 37 (| CFR 1.181, should be promptly filed to | | |